MISCELLANEOUS.

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Passed
Supdt

G.O. No. 724. 16th February 1951

Labour—Disputes—Dispute between the workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kadroli, Mangalore—Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore—Published.

Published as Notfn No. 198
at pages 323-324 of Part I
of F.S.G. Gazette d 27-2-51

18

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 724, 16th February 1951

Labour—Disputes—Dispute between the workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore—Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore—Published.

READ—the following papers:—

I

G.O. Ms. No. 3573, Development, dated 8th September 1950.

II

From the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore, dated 9th February 1951, No. I.D. 8-C of 1950.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, COIMBATORE.

PRESENT:

SRI P. V. KRISHNASWAMI, B.A., B.L.,
Industrial Tribunal.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 8-C OF 1950.

[In the matter of the dispute between the workers and the Management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore. (Vide G.O. Ms. No. 3573, Development, dated 8th September 1950.)]

Messrs. M. S. Menon, M.A., BAR.-AT-LAW and G. B. Pai, M.A., B.L., Advocates, Ernakulam—*For the Management.*

Sri B. S. Bhaskar Rai, B.A., B.L., Advocate and President, the Commonwealth Tile Workers' Union, Mangalore—*For the workers.*

AWARD.

Reference for adjudication of the question of the right of Sri Babu Shetty and Sri Ganappa, two employees of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore, for reinstatement or gratuity.

1. The statement of the two workmen is to the effect that they have put in services respectively of 16 and 28 years, that there was no question of filing or sending any leave application because such was not the practice; the fact that they had to submit such applications was not intimated to them; that even to this day leave applications are not insisted upon. However, in fact they sent word through friends regarding their illness. The Standing Orders were not given to them or brought to their knowledge. They have been dismissed merely because they were office-bearers of the Union.

2. The employer's statement runs that the two workers were discharged from service with effect from 17th March 1950, for absence without leave; they were given an adequate opportunity to submit their explanation; punishment was awarded only after due enquiry. The Company's Standing Orders have been followed.

3. The point for consideration is that set out in the reference, viz., are Babu Shetty and Ganappa entitled to be reinstated in service or eligible for gratuity equivalent to 15 days' wages or to any lesser amount for each year of service?

4. Babu Shetty and Ganappa have examined themselves while on behalf of the employer three persons have been examined including the General Manager. The two workmen have pleaded that because of illness they did not attend the factory and claim to have sent word through their friends about their illness to the factory. They plead also that written applications for leave are not necessary and that there is no rule to that effect; if there is a rule it is not insisted on. They further allege that if there are Standing Orders justifying their dismissal, they were unaware of the same.

5. It has been proved that Babu Shetty was Secretary of the Labour Union during the strike which preceded his dismissal while Ganappa was an active member of the Union and they were always together. Thus if misconduct on their part, i.e., continuous absence without leave is not proved it has to be held that there is room for suspicion of victimisation.

6. That the two workmen were absent without leave during the same period is not in dispute. They contend that it is not usual to apply for leave. That this is not correct is clear from the fact that the employer has produced through M.W. 3 a whole file of leave applications ranging from 13th August 1948 to 31st May 1950. Neither side was anxious that the same should be exhibited. What is even more to the point is that Babu Shetty, the erstwhile Secretary has himself applied on 23rd December 1949 for leave, i.e., some time prior to the absence without leave which resulted in his dismissal. That application of his is entirely in handwriting in pencil in the local language and is Exhibit M-11. It was even then translated and put up before the Group Manager, Mr. Fowler who directed him to report himself to the Company's Doctor for treatment. Thus it will not avail Babu Shetty or Ganappa to say that he was not aware of other workmen submitting leave applications or that he did not know that he had to apply in writing for leave.

7. Rule 22 (*f*) of the Standing Orders for operatives is relied on in support of the present dismissal. It reads so far as it may be necessary for the disposal of the instant case thus and the book has been filed as Exhibit M-12 in connected Industrial Dispute No. 8 of 1950.

"A Workman may be dismissed without notice if he is found to be guilty of misconduct. No order of dismissal shall be made unless the workman concerned is informed in writing of the alleged misconduct and is given an opportunity to explain the circumstances alleged against him. In awarding punishment under this Standing Order, the Manager shall take into account the gravity of the misconduct, the previous record, if any, of the workman and any other extenuating or aggravating circumstances that may exist. A copy of the order made by the Manager shall be supplied to the workman concerned. The following acts or omissions will be treated as misconduct.

* * * * * *

22 (*f*). Habitual absence without leave or absence without leave for more than three consecutive working days without sufficient cause."

8. That Babu Shetty was absent without leave from 28th February to 15th March 1950, i.e., for more than three consecutive days is not disputed: likewise Ganappa from 22nd February to 14th March 1950. Absence thus without leave for more than three consecutive working days is admitted. The next question is whether the absence was without sufficient cause.

9. The only cause now alleged in common is illness and there is absolutely no proof thereof. Not even corroborative oral testimony is forthcoming. What is definitely against the allegation of illness is that on 6th March 1950 during the period of continued absence, both these workmen were hale and healthy enough to walk to the factory to receive their pay for February. Even thereafter they both continued absent. They were not ill to receive their salary but they affected illness for a long period both before and after that date on which they received their salary. Thus sufficient cause is not made out.

10. They were given due notice to explain and their explanations have been recorded in Exhibits M-2 and M-3 by the then Group Manager whose interpreter then was Mr. Karkada, M.W. 1 while the Head Maistry, M.W. 2 was also present. Ganappa then said that he was attended to by some outside native doctor whose name, however, he did not know. He said that he sent word through his wife—though his statement mentions it was a friend—to the maistry and though his wife is still a work-woman in this factory she has not now been examined. Babu Shetty's statement on 16th March 1950 was to the effect that he did not know it was necessary to send a leave application. He did not inform anyone when he was ill and does not cite as a witness the friend through whom according to his written statement he sent word to the factory about his illness. In all these circumstances of this case, there has been absolutely no justification

for the long absence without leave of these two prominent members of the Labour Union. Ganappa had been earlier suspended on 13th May 1949 for inciting on 7th May 1949 whilst on the premises operatives to strike work. He was suspended for 2½ days. He was warned then that any repetition of misconduct will ensure dismissal. Both these workmen have merely abused their position as office-bearers of the Union, and have attempted to set a bad example to the other workmen thereby undermining discipline and creating a set-back for production. The dismissal in both these cases is clearly correct and I so find. They are not entitled to reinstatement.

11. Babu Shetty is now running a small hotel and Ganappa is working in another tile factory. The issue raises the question of the gratuity that they may be entitled to. Ganappa has put in much more than 22 years of service and a joint statement Exhibit M-12 records the same. Exhibit M-12 is the result of the General Manager's astonishingly thorough and perfectly fair investigation of his registers maintained and preserved with astounding regularity during all these long years. There is a break in Ganappa's service between 27th March 1935 and 1st June of that year but it is nothing serious and should be condoned in a case of this type. The employer urges that under the rules now in operation of which a copy has been available the grant of gratuity is purely discretionary with his Board in England and is to be awarded only in the case of persons with a record of good conduct and satisfactory service. He urges that there is no justification for grant of gratuity in a case of dismissal for misconduct even though the workman has served for very much more than 22 years. Though these contentions are *prima facie* acceptable and without desiring to create a precedent and solely on the facts of this case I am inclined to award only Ganappa gratuity at the rate of 2 rupees per year of service plus 100 per cent dearness allowance as he is an employee about 46 years of age. Regarding Babu Shetty, his period of service is only about 13 years and he is not entitled to any gratuity and I so find. The gratuity payable to Ganappa will be paid within three months of the publication of this award.

12. There will be no order as to costs.

Coimbatore,
3rd February 1951.

P V. KRISHNASWAMI,
Industrial Tribunal.

Order—No. 724, Development, dated 16th February 1951.

Whereas the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore in respect of the industrial dispute between the workers and the management of the Commanwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore, has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), His Excellency the Governor of Madras hereby directs that the said award be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*.

(By order of His Excellency the Governor)

J. M. LOBO PRABHU,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintendent, Government Press (for publication in the *Fort. St. George Gazette*).
" Commissioner of Labour, (20 copies).
" Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore.
" Management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore.
" Secretary, Commonwealth Tile Factory Workers' Union, Kudroli, Mangalore.
" District Magistrate, South Kanara.
" Industrial Tribunal (I), High Court Buildings, Madras.
" Industrial Tribunal (II), Block No. XIV, Fort St. George, Madras.
" Industrial Tribunal, Madurai.
" Industrial Tribunal, Vijayawada at Guntur.
" Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi (10 copies).
" Secretary to the Government of Bihar, Labour Department, Patna.
" Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Labour and Housing Department, Bombay.
" Secretary to the Government of West Bengal, Labour Department, Calcutta (2 copies).
" Secretary to the Government of Orissa, Commerce and Labour Department, Cuttack (3 copies).
" Secretary to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Labour Department, Lucknow (2 copies).
" Secretary to the Government of Madhya Pradesh, Labour Department, Nagpur (3 copies).
" Chief Secretary to the Government of Assam, General and Judicial Department, Shillong (3 copies).
" Commissioner of Labour and Employment, Patna.
" Chairman, Industrial Tribunal, Bihar, Jamshedpur.
" Deputy Commissioner of Labour (Information) Civil Secretariat Buildings, Fort Bombay.
" Registrar of Industrial Courts, Bombay (2 copies).
" Commissioner of Labour, West Bengal, Calcutta.
" Labour Commissioner, Uttar Pradesh P.B. No. 220, Kanpur.
" Industrial Tribunal, Punjab, Bhandrath Road, Jullunder City.

To the Labour Commissioner, Assam, Shillong.
" the Chief Commissioner, Delhi (2 copies).
" the Labour Commissioner, Punjab, Seth Pochardas Buildings, Nicholson Road, Ambala Cantonment.
" the Director of Industries and Labour, Delhi.
" the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer (3 copies).
" the Chief Commissioner, Coorg (3 copies).
" the Chief Secretary to the Government of Hyderabad, Hyderabad (Deccan) (3 copies).
" the Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Bangalore (3 copies).
" the Chief Secretary to the Government of Sourashtra, Rajkot (3 copies).
" the Chief Secretary to the Government of Travancore and Cochin, Trivandrum (5 copies).
" the Chief Secretary to the Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur (3 copies).
" the Chief Secretary, Patiala and East Punjab States Union Government, Patiala (3 copies).
" the Principal Secretary, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, Srinagar (3 copies).
" the Registrar, Labour Appellate Tribunal, City Ice Building 4th Flour, 298, Bazaar Gate Street, Bombay (6 copies).
" Sri R. Venkataraman, M.A., B.L., No. 1/174, High Road, Royapetta, Madras.
" the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) First Floor, Flat No. 12, Khaleeli Mansions, Mount Road, Madras.
" the Director-General, International Labour Organization, Geneva.
" the Regional Director of Resettlement and Employment, Cathedral P.O., Madras.
" the Chief Commissioner, Kutch, Bhuj (3 copies).
" the Chief Commissioner, Bhopal, Bhopal (3 copies).
" the Chief Commissioner, Bilaspur (Simla Hills) (3 copies).
" the Chief Commissioner, Vindhya Pradesh, Reva (3 copies).
" the Chief Commissioner, Manipur, Imphal (3 copies).
" the Chief Commissioner, Tripura, Agartala (3 copies).
" the Chief Commissioner, Himachal Pradesh, Simla (3 copies).

Forwarded to the

(By order)

Superintendent.

From
Sri P.V.Krishnaswami,B.A.,B.L.,
Industrial Tribunal,
Brahmin Extension,
Coimbatore.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Development Department,
Fort St. George,
Madras.

Sir, I.D.8-C of 1950 Date 9-2-51 (D.No.14451

Sub: Labour - Disputes between the workers and the Management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore. - submission of award.

16254 P1 10.2.51.

Ref. G.O.Ms.No.3573 Development Dept.,dated 8th Sep.50.

I have the honour to enclose herewith my award in duplicate in the disputes between the workers and the Management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory,Kudroli, Mangalore, which were referred to me for decision.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
Coimbatore.

KKs/-
Enc: 2

PERSONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO G... 10 FEB 1951 DEVELOPMENT DEPART...

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, COIMBATORE.

Present: Sri P.V.Krishnaswami,B.A.,B.L.

Industrial Dispute No.8-C of 1950.

In the matter of the dispute between the workers and the Management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory,Kudroli,Mangalore. (Vide G.O.Ms.No.3573 Development Dept.,dated 8th Sep.1950).

M/s M.S.Menon,M.A.,Bar-at-Law & G.R.Pai, M.A.,B.L., Advocates, Ernakulam.	For the Management.
Sri T.S.Bhaskar Rai, B.A., B.L., Advocate & President, Commonwealth Tile Workers Union, Mangalore.	For the Workers.

A W A R D.

Reference for adjudication of the question of the right of Sri Babu Shetty and Sri Ganappa, 2 employees of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore for reinstatement or gratuity.

1. The statement of the two workmen is to the effect that they have put in services respectively of 16 and 28 years, that there was no question of filing or sending any leave application because such was not the practice: the fact that they had to submit such applications was not intimated to them: that even to this day leave applications are not insisted upon. However, in fact they sent word through friends regarding their illness. The standing orders were not given to them or brought to their knowledge. They have been dismissed merely because they were office bearers of the Union.

2. The employer's statement runs that the two workers were discharged from service with effect from 17-3-50 for absence without leave: they were given an adequate opportunity to submit their explanation: punishment was awarded only after due enquiry. The Company's Standing Orders have been followed.

3. The point for consideration is that set out in the reference, viz., are Babu Shetty and Ganappa entitled to be reinstated in service or eligible for gratuity equivalent to

15 days wages or to any lesser amount for each year of service?

4. Babu Shetty and Ganappa have examined themselves while on behalf of the employer 3 persons have been examined including the General Manager. The two workmen have pleaded that because of illness they did not attend the factory and claim to have sent word through their friends about their illness to the factory. They plead also that written applications for leave are not necessary and that there is no rule to that effect: if there is a rule it is not insisted on. They further allege that if there are standing orders justifying their dismissal they were unaware of the same.

5. It has been proved that Babu Shetty was Secretary of the Labour Union during the strike which preceded his dismissal while Ganappa was an active member of the Union and they were always together. Thus if mis-conduct on their part i.e. continuous absence without leave is not proved it has to be held that there is room for suspicion of victimisation.

6. That the two workmen were absent without leave during the same period is not in dispute. They contend that it is not usual to apply for leave. That this is not correct is clear from the fact that the employer has produced through M.W.3 a whole file of leave applications ranging from 13-6-48 to 31-5-50. Neither side was anxious that the same should be exhibited. What is even more to the point is that Babu Shetty, the erstwhile Secretary has himself applied on 23-12-49 for leave i.e. some time prior to the absence without leave which resulted in his dismissal. That application of his is entirely in handwriting in pencil in the local language and is Exhibit M-11. It was even then translated and put up before the Group Manager Mr.Fowler who directed him to report himself to the Company's Doctor for treatment. Thus it will not avail Babu Shetty or Ganappa to say that he was not aware of other workmen submitting leave applications or that he did not know that he

had to apply in writing for leave.

7. Rule 22(f) of the Standing Orders for operatives is relied on in support of the present dismissal. It reads so far as it may be necessary for the disposal of the instant case thus and the book has been filed as Exhibit M-12 in connected I.D. 8/50.

> "A Workmen may be dismissed without notice if he is found to be guilty of misconduct. No order of dismissal shall be made unless the workman concerned is informed in writing of the alleged misconduct and is given an opportunity to explain the circumstances alleged against him. In awarding punishment under this standing order, the Manager shall take into account the gravity of the mis-conduct, the previous record, if any, of the workman and any other extenuating or aggravating circumstances that may exist. A copy of the order made by the Manager shall be supplied to the workman concerned. The following acts or omissions will be treated as mis-conduct.
>
> x x x x x x
>
> 22(f). Habitual absence without leave or absence without leave for more than three consecutive working days without sufficient cause."

8. That Babu Shetty was absent without leave from 28-2-50 to 15-3-50 i.e. for more than three consecutive days is not disputed: likewise Ganappa from 22-2-50 to 14-3-50. Absence thus without leave for more than 3 consecutive working days is admitted. The next question is whether the absence was without sufficient cause.

9. The only cause now alleged in common is illness and there is absolutely no proof thereof. Not even corroborative oral testimony is forthcoming. What is definitely against the allegation of illness is that on 6th March 50 during the period of continued absence, both these workmen were hale and hearty enough to walk to the factory to receive their pay for February. Even thereafter they both continued absent. They were not ill

to receive their salary but they affected illness for a long period both before and after that date on which they received their salary. Thus sufficient cause is not made out.

10. They were given due notice to explain and their explanations have been recorded in Exhibit M-2 and M-3 by the then Group Manager whose interpreter then was Mr.Karkada,W.W.1 while the Head Clerk, W.W.2 was also present. Ganappa then said that he was attended to by some outside native doctor whose name however, he did not know. He said that he sent word through his wife - though his statement mentions it was a friend to the factory and though his wife is still a work-woman in this factory she has not now been examined. Babu Shetty's statement on 16-5-50 was to the effect that he did not know it was necessary to send a leave application. He did not inform any one when he was ill and does not cite as a witness the friend through whom according to his written statement he sent word to the factory about his illness. In all these circumstances of this case, there has been absolutely no justification for the long absence without leave of these two prominent members of the Labour Union. Ganappa had been earlier suspended on 15-5-49 for inciting on 7-5-49 whilst on the premises operatives to strike work. He was suspended for 2½ days. He was warned then that any repetition of misconduct will ensure dismissal. Both these workmen have merely abused their position as office bearers of the Union, and have attempted to set a bad example to the other workmen thereby undermining discipline and creating a set-back for production. The dismissal in both these cases is clearly correct and I so find. They are not entitled to reinstatement.

11. Babu Shetty is now running a small hotel and Ganappa is working in another tile factory. The issue raises the question of the gratuity that they may be entitled to. Ganappa has put in much more than 22 years of service and a joint statement Exhibit M-12 records the same. Exhibit M-12 is the result of the General Manager's astonishingly thorough and perfectly fair investigation of his registers maintained and preserved with astounding

regularity during all these long years. There is a break in Ganappa's service between 27th March 35 and 1st June of that year but it is nothing serious and should be condoned in a case of this type. The employer urges that under the rules now in operation of which a copy has been available the grant of gratuity is purely discretionary with his Board in England and is to be awarded only in the case of persons with a record of good conduct and satisfactory service. He urges that there is no justification for grant of gratuity in a case of dismissal for misconduct even though the workman has served for very much more than 22 years. Though these contentions are prima facie acceptable and without desiring to create a precedent and solely on the facts of this case I am inclined to award only Ganappa gratuity at the rate of 2 rupees per year of service plus 100% dearness allowance as he is an employee about 46 years of age. Regarding Babu Shetty, his period of service is only about 13 years and he is not entitled to any gratuity and I so find. The gratuity payable to Ganappa will be paid within 3 months of the publication of this award.

12. There will be no order as to costs.

Coimbatore,
Dated: 3--2--1951.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
Coimbatore.

RKM/-

Tiruchi dt. 1

Dev.Dept. 91

Sub:- Labour - Disputes - Dispute between the ~~xxx~~ workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore - Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore - Published.

pp.1-2 C 6 of (T) Read:- G.O.Ms.No. 3573 Dev. dated 8-9-50

C 6

From the Ind. Tribunal, Coimbatore
No. 9.D.8-C ~~dated~~ of 1950 dated 9.2.51

G.O.Ms.No. 724 dated 16.2.51.

C 6

Whereas the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore, in respect of the industrial dispute between the workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947), His Excellency the Governor of Madras hereby directs that the said award be published in the Fort St. George Gazette;

GM 14.2.51

16.2.51

15/2/51

15/2

To the S.G.P. for publication

" the C. of L.

" the Ind. Tribunal (Coimbatore)

" Management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore

" Secretary, Commonwealth Tile Factory Workers union, Kudroli, Mangalore.

By Regd Post Ack due. Ack due by P.P. Ack Due BPS 24-61

" D. M. South Kanara

" Industrial Tribunal I Madras High Court Buildings

" ~~Ind. Tribunal II Madras~~ Block No XIV F.S.G. Madras.

" Ind Tribunal, Madurai

" " Vijayawada at Guntur.

12 A 10

,, [illegible]
,, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi (10 copies).
,, Secretary to the Government of Bihar, Labour Department, Patna.
,, Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Labour and Housing Department, Bombay.
,, Secretary to the Government of West Bengal, Labour Department, Calcutta (2 copies).
,, Secretary to the Government of Orissa, Commerce and Labour Department, Cuttack (3 copies).
,, Secretary to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, Labour Department, Lucknow (2 copies).
,, Secretary to the Government of Madhya Pradesh, Labour Department, Nagpur (3 copies).
,, Chief Secretary to the Government of Assam, General and Judicial Department, Shillong (3 copies).
,, Commissioner of Labour and Employment, Patna.
,, Chairman, Industrial Tribunal, Bihar, Jamshedpur.
,, Deputy Commissioner of Labour (Information) Civil Secretariat Buildings, Fort Bombay.
,, Registrar of Industrial Courts, Bombay (2 copies).
,, Commissioner of Labour, West Bengal, Calcutta.
,, Labour Commissioner, Uttar Pradesh P.B. No. 220, Kanpur.
,, Industrial Tribunal, Punjab, Bhandrath Road, Jullunder City.

To the Labour Commissioner, Assam, Shillong.
,, the Chief Commissioner, Delhi (2 copies).
,, the Labour Commissioner, Punjab, Seth Pochardas Buildings, Nicholson Road, Ambala Cantonment.
,, the Director of Industries and Labour, Delhi.
,, the Chief Commissioner, Ajmer (3 copies).
,, the Chief Commissioner, Coorg (3 copies).
,, the Chief Secretary to the Government of Hyderabad, Hyderabad (Deccan) (3 copies).
,, the Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore, Bangalore (3 copies).
,, the Chief Secretary to the Government of Sourashtra, Rajkot (3 copies).
,, the Chief Secretary to the Government of Travancore and Cochin, Trivandrum (5 copies).
,, the Chief Secretary to the Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur (3 copies).
,, the Chief Secretary, Patiala and East Punjab States Union Government, Patiala (3 copies).
,, the Principal Secretary, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, Srinagar (3 copies).
Deputy ,, the Registrar, Labour Appellate Tribunal, City Ice Building 4th Flour, 298, Bazaar Gate Street, Bombay (6 copies).
,, Sri R. Venkataraman, M.A., B.L., No. 1/174, High Road, Royapetta, Madras.
,, the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) First Floor, Flat No. 12, Khaleeli Mansions, Mount Road, Madras.
,, the Director-General, International Labour Organization, Geneva.
,, the Regional Director of Resettlement and Employment, Cathedral P.O., Madras.
,, the Chief Commissioner, Kutch, Bhuj (3 copies).
,, the Chief Commissioner, Bhopal, Bhopal (3 copies).
,, the Chief Commissioner, Bilaspur (Simla Hills) (3 copies).
,, the Chief Commissioner, Vindhya Pradesh, Reva (3 copies).
,, the Chief Commissioner, Manipur, Imphal (3 copies).
,, the Chief Commissioner, Tripura, Agartala (3 copies).
,, the Chief Commissioner, Himachal Pradesh, Simla (3 copies).

Registrar, Labour Appellate Tribunal
20/1 Gurusaday Road
Calcutta
Mail all exps. S.G.
1891
2-4-49

II

Rev. Dept.

Memo No. 16254 - PI/51-1 dated 16.2.51.

Sub:- Labour - Disputes - Dispute between the workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore Award of the Ind. Tribunal, Coimbatore - Printing and publication of.

Ref:- G.O.Ms.No. 734 dated 16.2.51.

The S.G.P. is requested to publish the above award along with the G.O. cited in the F.S.G.Gazette dated the 27th ~~Feb~~ 1951 without fail and to send to this Dept. immediately thereafter 60 signature copies and 90 spare copies thereof. The G.O. should contain the address entries also.

To the S.G.P.

P.T.O

Devt Dept

15.

Summary

Press Release No. 100/ dt 19.2.51

The dispute between the workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore in respect of the discharge of two workers, Babu Shetty and Ganappa has been referred to the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore. On enquiry, the Tribunal has passed an award that the ~~the~~ two workers are not entitled to reinstatement ~~but~~ Ganappa alone ~~will be entitled to~~ has been awarded a gratuity at the rate of Rs 2 per year of service ~~and~~ plus 100% dearness allowance, which shall be paid to him within 3 months of the publication of the award.

To AS

The Press Release may be sent to P.W. (I & P) for issue.

P.W. (I & P).

DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY
16 FEB 1951
C3/PA III

Devt W.C 16254 PD/51-1

May ~~issue~~

P.W (I&P)

The press release has been issued. The Case may be returned to Dev.

D.O 1295/51-1 20325

To AS

May be filed. Printed copies of the award may be awaited.

Devt Dept

Devt Dept

15.

Summary

Press Release No. 100/9 19.2.51

The dispute between the workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore in respect of the discharge of two workers, Babu Shetty and Ganappa has been referred to the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore. On enquiry, the Tribunal has passed an award that the ~~two~~ workers are not entitled to reinstatement. ~~Ganappa~~ Ganappa alone ~~will be entitled to~~ has been awarded a gratuity at the rate of Rs 2 per year of service ~~and~~ plus 100% dearness allowance, which shall be paid to him within 3 months of the publication of the award.

To AS

The Press Release may be sent to P.W. (J&P) for issue.

P.W. (J&P).

DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY 16FEB1951 C3/PAIII

Devt w.o 16254 P1/51-1

The press release has been issued. The Case may be returned to Devt.

w.o 1295/51-1 20325

To AS

May be filed. Printed copies of the award may be awaited.

Devt Dept

PRESS RELEASE NO.100 DATED 19TH FEBRUARY, 1951.

The dispute between the workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore in respect of the discharge of two workers, Baby Shetty and Ganappa has been referred to the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore. On enquiry, the Tribunal has passed an award that the two workers are not entitled to reinstatement. But Sri Ganappa alone has been awarded a gratuity at the rate of Rs. 2/- per year of service plus 100% dearness allowance, which shall be paid to him within three months of the publication of the award.

(ISSUED BY THE DIRECTOR OF INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY).

---

kkm/19.2

A/192.

DW. PI. 19

CB. Extract.

60284 PI
3.6.51.

S.NO. 111

Date of entry = 20.2.51.

Subject Award in the dispute in Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kundrola

G.O. C.No 162 54 PI/51.

No. & date of the G.O. GO Ms. 7 L.4 16.2.51 — (C)

Date when further action is to be taken ... 27.5.51.

20.

To Mme
CM
4-6-5

45
5/6

Devt Dept

Memo No. 60284 PI/51-pl 4-6-51

Sub:- Labour - Disputes - Dispute between the workers and the management of the Common wealth Tile Factory, Kudwli - Mangalore.

Ref:- G.O. MS. 724 Devt dated 16.2.51. (C)

The C.of.C. is requested to state whether the award published in the G.O cited has been implemented. A reply may be sent before 1-7-51

CM
3.6.51

(Sd)

To the C
N.R. 1-7

21 B

A.4.No.35234/51.

Office of the
Commissioner of Labour, Chepauk, Madras.
Dated: 11th June, '51.

Ffom

Sri C.G. Reddi,
Commissioner of Labour, Madras.

65451 PI
11-6-51.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Development Department, Fort St. George, Madras.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
18 JUN 1951

Sir,

Sub: Labour - Disputes - Dispute between the workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore.

Ref: Government Memo.No.60284 P.I/51 dated 4-6-51.

*****

The Labour Officer, Kozhikode, has reported that the award published in G.O.Ms.No.724, Development, dated 16-2-51 has been duly implemented by the management.

for Commissioner of Labour.

ks.11/6:

MR 12.6.51 To AS
May be lodged and added to the G.O. at ©
SM 15.6.51
Dept dept

Devt Dept

28/15/2

I.L.S. 4 Pt/51

Sub:- Labour - Disputes - Dispute between the workers and the managements of Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli - Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore.

Ref:- From the Industrial Tribunal, Coimbatore I.D. 8-C of 1950 dated 9-2-51.

C.6

To AS

A dispute arose between the workers and the management of the Commonwealth Tile Factory, Kudroli, Mangalore over the termination of the services of two workers viz Babu Shetty and Ganappa. As the parties to the dispute were unable to arrive at an amicable settlement, the dispute was referred to the Industrial Tribunal, ~~for adjudication~~ Coimbatore for adjudication. After enquiry the Tribunal has submitted an award with the recommendation that the two workmen are not entitled to reinstatement, that Ganappa alone will be given a gratuity ~~of~~ at the rate of Rs 2 per year of service plus 100% dearness allowance and that this gratuity will be paid within 3 months of the publication of this award.

The above award may be published in the Fort St George gazette as required by section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. A summary of it may be released to the Press. Drafts are submitted for approval.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
15 FEB 1951
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

16-2-51 15/2/51 S 15/2

(LC-RS) 19/2